

The School District of Lee County

Lehigh Acres Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Lehigh Acres Middle School

651 SUNRISE BLVD., Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://lhm.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Freeman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Lehigh Acres Middle School

651 SUNRISE BLVD., Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://lhm.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a supportive learning environment through rigorous and engaging instruction

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering lifelong learners to thrive in a global community

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gibson, Brian	Principal	
Thomas, Lisanne	Assistant Principal	
Teixeira, Miguel	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Alana	Instructional Coach	
Ryan, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Schultz, Scott	Instructional Coach	
Shaw, Taylie	Instructional Coach	
Arias, Priscilla	SAC Member	
Fine, Mary	Instructional Coach	
Plucker, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Lewis, Vincent	Assistant Principal	
Perez, Delilah	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/31/2019, Michelle Freeman

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

89

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	403	487	411	0	0	0	0	1301	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	23	33	0	0	0	0	107	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	45	28	0	0	0	0	87	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	1	20	0	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	6	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	118	118	0	0	0	0	331	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	121	97	0	0	0	0	305	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	95	86	0	0	0	0	269	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	17	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	460	453	432	0	0	0	0	1345	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	73	64	0	0	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	68	57	0	0	0	0	214	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	205	179	0	0	0	0	563	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	76	64	0	0	0	0	214	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	460	453	432	0	0	0	0	1345	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	73	64	0	0	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	68	57	0	0	0	0	214	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	205	179	0	0	0	0	563	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	76	64	0	0	0	0	214	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	55%	54%	39%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	54%	49%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	44%	47%	40%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	46%	64%	58%	45%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	64%	57%	57%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	54%	51%	45%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	32%	50%	51%	37%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	70%	72%	50%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	41%	52%	-11%	54%	-13%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	51%	-10%	52%	-11%
	2018	35%	50%	-15%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	41%	57%	-16%	56%	-15%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	39%	47%	-8%	55%	-16%
	2018	37%	41%	-4%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	57%	-26%	54%	-23%
	2018	42%	65%	-23%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	43%	60%	-17%	46%	-3%
	2018	32%	47%	-15%	45%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	46%	-16%	48%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	50%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%
2018	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	59%	29%	61%	27%
2018	94%	60%	34%	62%	32%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	50%	50%	57%	43%
2018	100%	53%	47%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	31	27	17	37	31	11	30			
ELL	25	40	32	38	53	51	16	48	38		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	75	69		90	63			90			
BLK	35	42	34	35	48	38	18	53	51		
HSP	42	47	31	46	53	49	34	61	67		
MUL	33	50	36	47	53		31	29			
WHT	57	63	42	59	56	50	46	70	81		
FRL	39	46	33	40	49	46	30	55	60		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	25	26	14	40	32	10	16			
ELL	13	37	39	27	44	34	2	26			
ASN	71	43		77	77						
BLK	32	44	42	35	47	37	24	53	64		
HSP	39	43	35	45	52	41	34	50	70		
MUL	33	54		48	65			30			
WHT	46	51	50	57	63	53	50	65	61		
FRL	37	43	38	43	52	41	32	52	69		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	41	46	16	47	39	16	16			
ELL	10	36	38	20	44	39	4	18			
ASN	83	83		83	75						
BLK	26	40	44	33	49	48	26	42	41		
HSP	41	50	39	46	58	41	38	50	68		
MUL	26	32		32	48						
WHT	52	55	45	57	64	58	50	60	64		
FRL	37	47	39	41	55	44	33	47	65		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science showed the lowest performance with 32% proficiency. Proficiency decreased from 35% the 2017-2018 school year to 32% the 2018-2019 school year. The trend shows a steady decrease in proficiency year to year. Contributing factors include teacher turnover and accountability among initiatives.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Learning gains of the reading bottom quartile showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 5% decrease. We do not have a specific program that addresses the bottom 25%.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Science, with 32% proficiency, had the largest gap when compared to the state average of 51%. The 19% discrepancy is due to factors that include contributing factors include teacher turnover and accountability among initiatives.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Civics showed the most improvement from 53% proficiency to 60%; a 7% improvement. The Civics team implemented strategies to increase proficiency including: pinpointing level two students for intensive remediation, exposing students to practice EOC type questions daily, implementing student

reflection sheets based on standards, student data tracking, and using the PLC process to plan remediation and enrichment of standards. The team based instruction off of district and formative data gathered quarterly throughout the school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance below 90%.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Science Proficiency- decreased
2. Learning gains for the bottom quartile (Reading)- decreased
3. Math learning gains- no change
4. Acceleration- no change
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Black/African American, Multi-racial, ELL and SWD will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: All low performing ESSA subgroups' performance data will increase to 42% for each category in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for low performing ESSA subgroup students at our school. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible: Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase the daily attendance rate among students. We have found a direct correlation between attendance and our school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	LAMS will increase the average percent of students in school from 94.35% to 95.5% as measured by the district support applications
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance team will analyze perfect attendance data and provide incentives and support as data indicates.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are in school have more learning opportunities. Students who are in our lowest performing sub groups needs additional learning opportunities to close the gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Track perfect attendance for the quarter
2. Track when students are out of classes or school Call home.
3. Send messages home through the school messenger.
4. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups and increase support when data indicates need.

Person Responsible Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase the amount of students that will stay in the classroom and decrease the amount of suspensions is the goal so that students have more learning opportunities.
Measurable Outcome:	LAMS will reduce OSS by 10%, as measured by the District Support Application, through integration of Social Emotional Learning standards and strategies into school-wide discipline, PBS, and MTSS processes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBS plan Social Emotional Learning strategies MTSS tier process Restorative practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These are strategies that the district uses and practices that have proven to work in our school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Track referral data
2. Follow the MTSS process
3. Refer students to appropriate department (counselor, peer mediator) for social emotional learning.
4. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups and increase supports when data indicates need.

Person Responsible Brian Gibson (brianlg@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase learning gains in reading and ELA as measured by FY21 FSA results.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -LAMS will increase students scoring proficiency in reading from 43% to 46%, as determined by the year 2021 ELA FSA. -LAMS will increase the number of students making learning gains from 49% to 51%, as measured by the year 2021 ELA FSA. -LAMS lowest 25% in Reading will increase learning gains from 34% to 40%, as measured by the FY 21 Reading FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Miguel Teixeira (migueltdt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Classroom-based intervention in lieu of electives for reading and math fundamentals -L25 Science Class focusing on reading and test-taking strategies -Mentors will meet with bottom 25% twice a month (data tracking/reflection, etc) -Use of iReady to progress monitor and provide differentiation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -District wide initiative to focus on L25 -Reading strategies need to implemented -Ensuring high yield strategies are used in the classroom. -iReady will provide diagnostic information and provide individualized learning paths to close achievement gaps, especially with our low performing ESSA subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identification
2. Professional Development
3. Data chats
4. Walkthroughs by administrators.
5. Use of iReady to progress monitor and provide differentiation
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data and increase supports as data indicates

Person Responsible Miguel Teixeira (migueltdt@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase proficiency and learning gains in science as data indicates that student achievement needs to increase in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	LAMS will increase the number of students earning proficiency in Science from 32% to 38%, as measured by the FY 21 Statewide Science Assessment
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Ryan (jenniferry@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Spiraling of annually assessed benchmarks Common Standard's Tracker used with fidelity Remediation to reflect data from common assessments Standards-based Instruction L25 Class: Appropriately placing students based on needs
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase the scores in the science department, students will need more targeted strategies and interventions to respond to data.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will teach standards based instruction with fidelity. 2. Teachers will remediate and enrich when necessary. 3. Teachers will reteach standards all year long. 4. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data and increase supports when data indicates need. 	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Ryan (jenniferry@leeschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase proficiency and learning gains in math so that students are able to master the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LAMS will increase students scoring proficiency in math from 46% to 50%, as determined by the FY 21 Math FSA -LAMS will increase learning gains in math from 53% to 60%, as determined by the FY 21 Math FSA -LAMS lowest 25% in Math will increase learning gains from 45% to 50%, as measured by the FY 21 Math FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Megan Barrett (meganmba@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Implement iReady and ALEKS for remediation and enrichment Teachers will have data chats with each student as they track their benchmarks based on assessments. PLCs will meet during common planning time to create lessons, homework assignments, and assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ALEKS will be utilized for remediation and enrichment -Data chats are imperative to have with the students, so that they understand where they are in class and in their learning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs and planning together is a district initiative -iReady will enable teachers to make data driven instructional decisions to target learning gaps and provide enrichment opportunities -Closely monitor low performing ESSA subgroup data and increase support when data indicates need

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students should be on ALEKS weekly/daily
2. Data chats after every common assessment
3. Data chats quarterly
4. Weekly-every Wednesday PLC planning
5. Implement iReady s to target learning gaps and provide enrichment opportunities
- 6.Closely monitor low performing ESSA subgroup data and increase support when data indicates need

Person Responsible Megan Barrett (meganmba@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by focusing on: attendance, behavior, bottom 25% in reading, science, and math.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00